

TAHOMA SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 409
King County, Washington
September 1, 1992 Through August 31, 1993

Schedule Of Federal Findings

1. Tahoma School District Officials Should Comply With Handicapped Program Requirements

Our audit of the handicapped program (CFDA 84.027) operated by Tahoma School District officials noted that of the 25 handicapped program student participant files tested, two participants had not been reviewed for reassessment by multidisciplinary teams (MDT) within the required three-year period. In addition, two participants had no individualized education program (IEP) developed within the required time period.

Title 34 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR), Part 300.534 (b) states in part:

... an evaluation of a child ... is conducted every three years or more frequently if conditions warrant, or if the child's parent or teacher requests an evaluation.

Washington Administrative Code 392-171-512 states in part:

Each identified student having a handicapping condition shall be reassessed ... by the multidisciplinary team ... at a minimum, once every three years or more frequently if required by this chapter.

Title 34 of the CFR, Part 300.341 states in part:

(a) Public Agencies. The SEA (state education authority) shall ensure that each public agency develops and implements an IEP for each of its children with disabilities.

It appears some of the teachers and a building principal were not aware of the importance of completing the IEP and reassessment within federal and state time requirements. District officials have implemented procedures to ensure IEPs, assessments, and reassessments are being performed for students currently enrolled.

Students are required to have an annual individualized education program and to be reassessed within the three-year period to ensure program eligibility. Student eligibility for the program is jeopardized when district officials neglect to prepare individualized education programs and to conduct reassessment reviews within the required time frame. Failure to prepare these programs and reassessment could result in ineligible individuals receiving benefits under the program; the district being required to repay funds spent on ineligible individuals; and the loss of future grant funding. Due to the nature of the program, we were unable to establish the amount of costs associated with the exceptions noted.

We recommend district officials timely perform and prepare the required reassessments and individual education programs.

We further recommend district officials consult with the Superintendent of Public Instruction in resolving this issue.